

1 **WO**

2
3
4
5
6 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA
8

9 United States of America,
10 Plaintiff/Respondent,

11 vs.

12 Armando Ramirez-Valadez
13 Defendant/Movant.
14

No. CV 11-1553-PHX-JAT (JFM)
CR 07-0798-PHX-JAT

ORDER

15
16 Pending before the Court is Movant's Motion to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence
17 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (Doc. 1). The Magistrate Judge issued a Report and
18 Recommendation ("R&R") (Doc. 6) recommending that the Motion be denied.

19 Neither party has filed objections to the R&R. Accordingly, the Court hereby accepts
20 the R&R. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (finding that district courts are not
21 required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection"
22 (emphasis added)); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en*
23 *banc*) ("statute makes it clear that the district judge must review the magistrate judge's
24 findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise" (emphasis
25 in original)); *see also Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F.Supp.2d 1219, 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003).

26 Accordingly,

27 **IT IS ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (Doc. 6)
28 is **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED**;

